

### **3. Berhan International Research Journal of Science and Humanities (BIRJSH)**

#### **Editorial Policy**

The **Berhan International Research Journal of Science and Humanities (BIRJSH)** is a multi-disciplinary annual journal published by the Debre Berhan University (DBU). BIRJSH is a peer reviewed Journal devoted to the study and promotion of natural sciences, social sciences, agricultural science, natural resources, forestry, mathematical and computational sciences, and social and humanity science related to applied sciences from Ethiopia and elsewhere from worldwide.

**BIRJSH** is particularly designed to satisfy the scientific research needs of researchers, practitioners and other scholars from all disciplines working in the broader areas of natural sciences, applied sciences, social science, humanities, and computational sciences.

#### **3.1 Publication Type**

**BIRJSH** publishes original research articles, review papers and short communications. It is accessible in both print and online platform.

#### **3.2 Publication Frequency**

**BIRJSH** is published once a year - one volume in December.

#### **3.3 Peer Review Process**

The Berhan International Research Journal of Science and Humanities (BIRJSH) uses an online submission and review system. BIRJSH uses a double-blind peer review process, meaning that author(s) and reviewers remain anonymous in the review process. The review period will take from six to 12 weeks, although this can vary depending on reviewer availability. Reviewers are asked to provide formative, constructive, and valuable feedback, even if an article is not deemed suitable for publication in the journal. Overall editorial responsibility rests with the journal's editors-in-chief.

#### **Submissions to the journal will go through the following review process:**

1. Upon the arrival of a manuscript, the editor makes a general assessment of its quality and it's fit with the scope of the journal.

2. If approved, the manuscript is passed on to one or more associate editors for recommendations and suggestions of expert referees. Typically, each manuscript will be reviewed by three referees, sometimes including the associate editor.

3. The referees follow the BIRJSH guidelines.

4. Based on the reviews, the editor decides on one of the following assessments:

a. Acceptance

b. Acceptance pending minor revisions

c. Advise to revise and resubmit

d. Rejection

Authors will be properly and timely informed of the editor's decision about their submitted manuscript. In the case of b and c, the editor will provide the authors with revision suggestions. In the case of c, the review process will begin again at point 2 after the resubmission of the manuscript.

5. Once the manuscript is accepted, the managing editor will prepare a definitive version in cooperation with a native English-language copy editor.

Members of the editorial board are permitted to submit their own papers to the journal. In cases where an author is associated with the journal, they will be removed from all editorial tasks for that paper and another member of the team will be assigned to handle the responsibility for overseeing peer review. A competing interest must also be declared within the submission and any resulting publication.

### **3.4 Reviewer Guidelines**

#### **General Guidance**

The primary purpose of peer review is providing the Editor with the information needed to reach a fair, evidence-based decision that adheres to the journal's editorial criteria. Review reports should also help authors revise their manuscript such that it may be accepted for publication. Reports accompanied by a recommendation to reject the paper should explain the major weaknesses of the research; this will help the authors prepare their manuscript for submission to a different journal.

Overall, a single manuscript should have at least two blind peer reviewers and the review process takes 10 days with a possibility of extension if the reviewers need more time. If the manuscript has major correction, the manuscript will be given for similar peer reviewers and or another new reviewer. The final decision will be made by the editor-in-chief of the journal including a submission for publication.

### *The Responsibility of the Peer Reviewer*

The peer reviewer is responsible for critically reading and evaluating a manuscript in their specialty field, and are expected to providing respectful, constructive, and honest feedback to authors about their submission. It is appropriate for the Peer Reviewer to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article, suggest ways to improve the strength, soundness, structure and clarity, and quality of the work, and evaluate the relevance and originality of the manuscript.

### **Before Reviewing**

Please consider the following:

#### **Conflict of Interest**

Reviewers should consider whether they have any conflict(s) of interest that may have an impact on the impartiality of the review. The invitation to review should be declined if any of the following situations apply:

- Collaboration with any of the authors in the last 36 months, including, but not limited to publications and current submissions.
- Authors with the same institutional affiliation as your own, including cases where there are multiple affiliations.
- Close personal relationship (spouse or family member) or professional connection (past or present PhD students and postdocs) with any of the authors.
- Financial interests related to or impacted by the manuscript under review or its topic.

#### **Inability to be objective.**

Failure to disclose a conflict of interest will be investigated and may lead to sanctions from the journal. Should the reviewer feel like they can maintain objectivity despite a potential conflict of interest, they are expected to inform the editor or editorial office upon receiving the invitation to review.

It is also important for reviewers to remain unbiased by considerations related to the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or any other characteristics of the authors, origin of a manuscript.

### **Does the article you are being asked to review match your expertise?**

If you receive a manuscript that covers a topic that does not sufficiently match your area of expertise, please notify the editor as soon as possible. Please feel free to recommend alternate reviewer.

### **Do you have time to review the paper?**

Finished reviews of an article should be completed within three weeks. If you do think you cannot complete the review within this time frame, please let the editor know for possible of extending the time. If you have agreed to review a paper but will no longer be able to finish the work before the deadline, please contact the editor as soon as possible.

### **Are there any potential conflicts of interests?**

While conflicts of interest will not disqualify you from reviewing the manuscript, it is important to disclose all conflicts of interest to the editors before reviewing. If you have any questions about potential conflicts of interests, please do not hesitate to contact the journal editorial office.

### **The Review**

When reviewing the article, please keep the following in mind:

#### **Content Quality and Originality,**

- How much does the submission contribute to the current state of scholarship?
- Is the article sufficiently novel and interesting to warrant publication?
- Does it add to the standard of knowledge?
- Does the article follow to the journal's standards?
- Are the research questions important and the author(s) clearly answer them?
- You might wish to do a quick literature search using tools such as Scopus to see if there are any reviews of the area. If the research has been covered previously, pass on references of those works to the editor.

## **Organization and Clarity**

- Title: Does the title clearly describe the article?
- Abstract: Does the abstract reflect the content of the article?
- Introduction: Does the introduction accurately convey the author's objectives and identify the issue under investigation? The introduction often summarizes pertinent studies to offer context and should indicate what findings—if any—of other authors are being disputed or expanded upon. The experiment, the hypothesis(es), and the overall experimental design or procedure should all be described.
- Method: Does the author adequately describe the process used to gather the data? Is the layout appropriate to provide a response to the presented question? Is the information provided sufficient for you to repeat the study? Does the paper specify the methods used? Do these have a purposeful order? Are the new methods thoroughly explained if they are? Was the sampling appropriate? Have the tools and supplies been sufficiently described? Has the author been accurate in describing measurements? Does the article make it clear what kind of data was recorded?
- Results: Here, the author or authors should verbally describe what they learned during their research. It ought to be logically organized and clearly laid out. You must think about whether the proper analysis has been done. Are the figures accurate? Please let the editor know when submitting your report if statistics are not your strong suit. This part should not contain results interpretation.
- Conclusion/Discussion: Do the results in this section seem to support and seem logical to you? Have the authors explained how the findings compare to predictions and past studies? Does the article challenge or contradict preexisting theories? Does the conclusion explain how the research has advanced our understanding of the field of science?
- Tables, Figures, Images: Are they appropriate? Do they properly show the data? Are they easy to interpret and understand?

**Scope** - Is the article in line with the aims and scope of the journal?

Article Types Considered

Delivery Science (Original research and review)

### **Original Data and Trials**

- Submissions should include data that demonstrates novel approaches for enhancing the systems, procedures, and equipment used in healthcare delivery.

### **Synthesis (Review Articles)**

Submissions should be a critical, systematic review of literature concerning issues that are relevant to the delivery of sciences like technologies, agriculture, health, and humanities. Reviews should be focused on one topic.

### **Final Comments**

All submissions are confidential and please do not discuss any aspect of the submissions with a third party.

If you would like to discuss the article with a colleague, please ask the editor first.

Please do not contact the author directly.

### **Ethical Issues:**

- Plagiarism: If you believe that an article substantially resembles another piece of writing, please inform the editor and provide as many specific details as you can.

- Fraud: Although it is highly challenging to catch a motivated fraudster, you should talk to the editor if you think the findings in an article are false.

- Other ethical issues: Has the privacy of medical research participants been protected? Has the ethical treatment of either human or animal subjects been compromised in any way? If so, the editor needs to be made aware of these as well.

### **Next Steps**

Please submit the "Reviewer's Comments" form to the receiving editorial office by the deadline in full. Your full, sincere input will be much valued. The editors will strongly consider your advice for an article when making the final decision.

When writing comments, please specify the section of comments intended for only the editors and the section of comments that can be returned to the author(s). Please never hesitate to contact the editorial office with any questions or concerns you may have.

A good review is a balanced critique of both the positive and negative attributes of the paper; specific feedback is more useful than general comments.

### **3.5 Publication Ethics**

Authors of the paper submitted to BIRJSH are fully responsible for ensuring any ethical issues related to their research and manuscript. They are responsible to abide by the publication ethical rules. BIRJSH may request the authors to submit ethical approval documents when needed. The paper is also expected to be free of conflict of interests to be considered for publication.

### **3.6 Plagiarism**

The editorial process is expected to check for plagiarism of the submitted papers using reliable Software solutions. A thresh-hold will be set by percentage to define plagiarism level, above which such papers should not be considered for publication.

### **3.7 Open Access Policy**

BIRJSH provides immediate open access to its content, upon registration, on the principle that making research freely available to the public supports a greater global exchange of knowledge.